**DISCUSSION ON DUNKEL DRAFT TEXT—CONTD.**

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Further discussion on the Dunkel Draft Text.

मिस्टर शिवाजी, आपके 5 मिनट है। कृपया आप 5 मिनट में अपने भाषण को खत्म करने की कोशिश करिए।

DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI (Andhra Pradesh): Madam, we are discussing Dunkel at the eleventh hour. The negotiations are scheduled to be completed by the 15th of this month. For the last six, seven years the Government did not seek seriously to take Parliament into confidence or the people of this country into confidence.

Madam, it is reported from Brussels that the Finance Minister of this country participated in the dis-discussion. Unfortunately, the Commerce Ministry was without a Head for quite some time. Mr. Chidambaram, the then Commerce Minister resigned. Later Mr. Pranab Mukherjee came in. And for want of his Membership in the Rajya Sabha for some more time the Commerce Ministry was without any head. Because of these a vacuum had been created in this country and the Commerce Ministry was not properly represented in the negotiations. As a result of this Commerce Ministry as well as the nation was kept in the dark for complete one year and it was not known what was happening at the negotiations level. It is reported in today's papers that the negotiations are at a dead-end and they have yet to take shape at Brussels. A controversy has been going on between various advanced countries like the USA, European Community, Japan and other grains exporting countries. I feel that the Commerce Ministry is finding a solace that the problem will be setttled by those developed countries instead of we putting our nose into it. The share of our country in the international trade is as low as 0.45 per cent. Therefore, it appears that at the negotiating table our country is not taken seriously by various developed countries. It is also a fact that in the GATT negotiations we had already seven rounds and we entered into the eighth round. But the eighth round is different when compared to other negotiations because some sweeping changes on tariffs, textiles, agriculture, trade-related investment measures and trade related intellectual property, rights, cross retaliations etc. are going to be incorporated through the Dunkel Draft and sweeping changes are envisaged on agriculture, production of seeds and so many other iitems. It is a fact that whenever a problem arises for the developed countries like the US, they are utilising the GATT for arm-twisting. Bill Clinton is twisting the arm of the GATT because America is facing an adverse balance of payments position. They are doing it to cope up with the trade deficit and the balance of payments problem. They wanted the intellectual property rights as well as the manufacture of seeds and other things to draw up sweeping changes in the GATT. In regard to textiles, I would say it is a fact that 30 per cent of our exports constitute exports in textiles, but unfortunately no definite agreement has been reached and it is ensured in the Draft that for quite a long time the textiles are kept outside the purview of the GATT and proper attention has not been paid in regard to the export of textiles from this country. I am very much doubtful whether India with its weak representation there and with its weak voice will be in a position to see that the negotiations are properly reflected in the final Draft. It is reported that as long as the balance of payments position is negative in our country, the market access will be 2 to 3 per cent and it is not going to affect our country. About two months

back it was reported by the International Monetary Fund that the per-capita income of this country is something like $ 1,250. No official agency from our country has denied it and nobody else from the Government has asked for a clarification from the IMF as to how they could arrive at the figure. I am very much afraid that the Government is contemplating that at no stage our balance of payments position will be comfortable. It feels that our BOP will be negative and the market accessability problem will not arise.

About the subsidies the fact is that in the developed countries the subsidies to agriculture are much more. For example, in U.S. there is 26.17 per cent subsidy, in Canada the subsidy is 33.5 per cent and in EEC countries the subsidy is 37 per cent. Even in our neighbouring Asian countries, in Korea, the subsidy is 60 per cent, whereas it is 23 per cent in Taiwan. But in our country, as far as agriculture is concerned, the subsidy is negative. We are having about minus 0.3 per cent negative subsidy for agriculture. In other countries like China, etc., also the subsidy is negative. So the subsidies are going to be curtailed in all the countries including the advanced countries. What steps does the Government propose to take to reduce subsidies in other countries? At the same time, even without Dunkel Draft or the GATT proposal being considered, already the proposals envisaged in the GATT prposals or the Dunkel Draft are being implemented in this country in the form of structural adjustments, in the form of reducing subsidy on fertilisers, in the form of reducing subsidy on other inputs of agriculture. I am very much afraid that proposals contained in the Dunkel Draft, recommendations of the Raja Chellian Committee and the recommendations of the Narasimham Committee are already being implemented and they are already in existence in this country without even considering the Dunkel Draft.

Madam, I feel that the Government is not serious about understanding of the Dunkel Draft, I am very much afraid that not even a handful of people in the Ministry of Commerce have laid their hands on the Dunkel Draft, not even ten people have rtad the Dunkel text in toto, leave alone the Minister and others. So this is how it is.

As far as seeds, research, *sui generis*, etc. etc., are concerned, there are a battalion of experts in the country and we are second to none in the entire world. We are third in the technical manpower, yet we failed to improve our agricultural system, we failed to improve the agricultural research in this country. Thereby an opportunity an atmosphere has been createdi in this country that unless some seeds are imported from other countries, unless some inputs are imported from other countries, unless some technical knowhow is obtained from other countries, it may not be possible to the Ministry of Agriculture as well as the Ministry of Commerce take stock and reassess the situation and see that our agriculture research also gives some fruits so that it percolates from the laboratory to the land. Unless this is done, I am very much afraid that nothing fruitful will come out.

Madam, the sorry state is...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will you please conclude?

DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI: I am trying to conclude.

Various wings of the Ministries like Commerce, Agriculture and Finance are are issuing some self-contradictory statements. The Secretary of the Commerce Department went on record that there was no other go except to sign the Dunkel Draft. So what is the thinking of the Government? Did the Government make up their mind to sign the draft? The 15th December is fast approaching. What are the proposals that are put forward by the Government to amend

[Dr. Yelamanchili Shivaji]

the existing Dunkel Draft in the negotiations? What steps have been taken to carry out these amendments? The Government had expressed a view that the final decision on accepting the Dunkel text with or without amendments is yet to be taken. So what position has the Government taken? How can a country give up its position on issues of vital importance simply because it was isolated? I would like to seek clarification on this point from the Minister.

(c) Government continues to take measures

As far as agriculture is concerned, it relates to the State Governments. No Assembly had discussed the matter except the Andhra Pradesh Assembly. The Andhra Pradesh Assembly had passed a resolution unanimously condemning the Dunkel Draft. In this contigency, what is the attitude of the Central Government? What are the amendments that are proposed by our Government in regard to the international negotiations of GATT? I would like to seek these clarifications from the Minister. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ahluwalia. You do not want to speak. Okay. Good. Mr. Swell. You have ten minutes.

SHRI G. G. SWELL (Meghalaya): Madam, there is a certain irony about this discussion. The Dunkel Proposals have been with us for more than a year now. There have been questions in Parliament demanding a discussion in this House. There have been working groups in this country that tried to stress certain points of view. But the Government has only hemmed and hawed. Nothing is coming out of them except certain isolated *obiter dicta* and *ex cathedras* which shed no light at all. Now, you come before this House five days—exactly five days—before the Draft is finalised and updated. Not even eight days. Eight days, and it will be that fateful day of the 15th of December when you have to decide whether you are going to subscribe to this Text or not. And, according to reports, the Director-General of GATT had put down the 13th of December as the day when he would lay the updated Text of the discussions, of the negotiations and observations on the table. Now, Madam, on the other hand, I think this discussion is also premature. We do not know exactly what is going to be laid on the Table on the 13th. The two biggest trading blocks in the world,... (*Interruptions*)... Madam, if I could have some peace from that side, it would be better. Hon. Members can go to the lobby and discuss. Why should they disturb Members when they are speaking? The two biggest trading blocks in the world today, the European Economic Community and the United States of America, reinforced now by the North Atlantic Free Trade Agreement, are still locked in a wrangle of negotiations and certain noises have been coming from there. Maybe by today or tomorrow at the latest, they would come out and then, together, they would bring forward certain amendments before the GATT negotiations and, take it from me, they being powerful trading blocks, those amendments will be accepted. And, therefore, the Draft of the Text, as it would emerge, would not be the Text that we are discussing today. The French are much wiser. Reports are that the French Parliament has slated the discussion on the Text, Draft, for the 13th and 14th, when the entire picture would be clear. And here, we are discussing, assuming certain things which may not be on the Table at all.

The Minister must be aware of the opinions in this House. Cutting across partly lines, practically all Members, including the Members from his side of the House, have opposed the subscription to the GATT Text, whatever emerges. Now, I am

going to ask him this beause the system in our country does not require the approval of Parliament. The ratification of an international treaty does not require the approval of Parliament. The Government has the prerogative. My question to him is, is he going to sail against the wind of the opinion in the entire House, If at all, it is his fate. (Interruption). There is one disturbing element affecting us. Yesterday, the Minister said that one-third of our exports were textiles. We earn a lot of foreign exchange from that.

We bemoan the fact that the Dunkel proposals did not deign it necessary to shorten the transition period for the phasing out of the multifibre agreement. We have wanted 7 years. The Dunkel proposals had laid down 10 years. According to the reports, the Americans are not even happy with that. They are putting pressure that the transition period should be 15 years, in which case we shall be in a very, very unenviable position.

But, having said that I would like to know whether we are in a position to stay aside from GATT. Yesterday, Dr. Ashok Mitra made the point that we are members of the GATT. We can still remain members and yet not subscribe to the Treaty. I would like to know whether we are in a position to stay aside and not subscribe to the Treaty. There have been discussions on the Intellectual Property Rights and the Patent Act. Now, under Dunkel, the application of patentability under GATT would be 10 years. We know for a fact that our country produces a large quantity of chemicals and pharmaceuticals.

According to the Americans, we have plagiarised their patent. We have tried to produce the same thing by different processes. That is what we have been doing and, therefore, our drugs are cheap and we are able to compete. But under Dunkel, the patent will not be processed. It will be the product. If a certain kind of drug or chemical is produced after what was patented in America, you cannot do it in India any more. You come under the mischief... (*Interruption*)...This is the position. Now Dunkel allows 10 years for transition. Suppose you do not sign the Dunkel Ttxt or you do not sign the GATT Text, whatever it is, there is nothing to prevent you from the operation of the American Trade Laws under Special-301 or Super-301, which immediately can impose ban on our exports to America, which can raise the tariff on our exports to America so as to make them entirely uneconomic. The Americans can do it today. They are not obligated under GATT, they can do it today. What are we going to do about it ...(*Interruption*)... The Minister looks worried. But if you are not under Dunkel, you are not under GATT. No; let us forget Dunkel because it is going to be an updated text, not going to be Dunkel any more. If you are not under GATT, there is nothing to prevent the Americans from imposing the Trade Laws even now. You are not protected. But under GATT you have 10 years during which you can reorganise. I would like, that we, in this House or in this country, take a look at what is going on in the world today. We are living in a modern world. Pravadoes shibboleth are not going to help. In Europe, customs barriers have come down visa barrier have come down. The twelve countrias of European Economic Community have operated the Maastricht. Treaty by which they will have a common currency, the same foreign policy and perhaps the same army. And very soon, het whole of Europe may come under it. The Scandinavian countries are not going to stay out very long and I think what we knew, as the East European countries also are not going to stay out very long. It is quite possible that even Russia, the Russian Federation, may come under some kind of an arrangement under the Maastricht Treaty, thus you have the whole of Europe where there is free movement of people, free movement

of goods. On the other side America, although it is such a large country, economically powerful country, has realised the need for creating a trade bloc. That is why it has agreed with Canada and Mexico to have the North American Free Trade Agreement, and, as the Minister is aware, as this House is aware, President Clinton is not satisfied only with NAFTA. He has initiated the discussion for an Asian Pacific Economic Co-operation in Seattle which was highlighted by his meeting with the President of China. Now the Asian Pacific Economic Co-operation will bring in China, an emerging economic tiger, will bring in Japan, which is a economic super power, will bring in Taiwan and other countries in Asia which are tigers in economy. and Russia also today is knocking at the doors of the Asian Pacific Economic Co-operation. President Clinton could not care less for GATT. The Asia-Pacific region produces one-half of the goods and services in the world and it controls about four-fifths of the trade in the world. They could not care less for GATT. And where are we in India? We are nowhere. We are nowhere near the Asian Pacific Economic Co-operation. We are isolated. Now how do you abut it? I think we have to think about it. Either we go back to the medieval ages, we do not export anything, we think only about feeding our people. Do we stay back or try to get an opening to the world? There is no other way for us. Americans can do without GATT. The European Economic Community can do without GATT. But for us, I think, GATT is the only opening, the only door which gives us some protection, which gives us some entry into the world market. These are the few things which I would like to put for the consideration of the Minister. It is unfortunate that he has come before this House at this late hour, only five days before the Text is to be placed on the Table. If he had come one year ago or six months ago he could have benefited from the views of the Members of this House. Now he comes here when there is practically nothing to do. I am not in a position to agree with my other Members that we should oppose GATT. I am not saying that because I don't want that we should be left out from the rest of the world and go back to the medieval ages. It is a fact. We are talking about... (Time-bell rings)...I am finishing Madam. This is the trouble. When you speak hastily, when you are in a hurry, it is very difficult to get your thoughts together.

Now we are talking about the specific question of patenting of seeds. It is all right. There is no patenting of seeds in India. It is all right. But who cares for the seeds that we produce in India? We are moving in a world where we have super seed. We should move in a way in which we have these seeds which can be genetically reproduced with high perfusive yield and of the necessary phytosanitary standards. We cannot sell our products to the rest of the world unless we can compete in price and we cannot compete in price unless the amount of production is more and the cost of production is less. We cannot compete in the market unless we have the necessary standard for products and, therefore, whether you have your own seeds or not, you cannot prevent your farmers some day from buying all these new seeds and using them for production. These are the few ideas which I want to put across to the Minister. He is being disturbed. He cannot listen to me. Obviously if he goes on like this I will be speaking in the air. We would have been happy if the Members did not disturb the Minister. Now you can do whatever you like. These are the ideas. I am not joining with the opposition on that because I know what is happening. But it is your mistake that you have come at the last moment. You have prerogative to sign or

not to sign. You do what is correct for this country having regard to what is happening in this world and face the consequences. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now I have got two speakers. Mr. Bhattacharya, you have got seven minutes. I will give seven minutes to Mr. Mann.

PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairman, I am sorry that I could not use my mother tongue Bengali. It would have been proper in view of my poor knowledge of English which was adduced to by the Chair.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I generally speak Hindi.

PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA: Only with the help of *Takriban* I was able to understand what was really the purport of the Deputy Chairman's observation. Anyway, since I could not take permission, I will continue in English.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhattacharya, it was in Hindi, not in English.

PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA: Somehow; it may be managed. But the worst is the Dunkel Draft. My friend, Prof. Swell, just exercised with it like anything I heard from him. Even Dr. Ashok Mitra, I am sure, did no speak in its favour which perhaps, Prof. Swell, might have done. This is a very obtuse and difficult subject. It is not known what it is. But even then it has to be answered. It is something like that. Mr. Chimanbhai Mehta rightly said, "It is like Brahma of the Hindus who embodies all qualities and no qualities." Prof. Swell lamented, "Only eight days before the final resolution." We are discussing if five days before the updated Draft is to be placed. The problems is from the side of the Government. Alll along they talked not only in double-face but in so many faces at so many places and the position has come to a pause when not the Minister but a civil servant makes policy statement on behalf of the Government. This is something which is a very hopeless situation, so to say. Prof. Swell has rightly said, the Government does require to take clearance from Parliament, of either House or of both the Houses, and can do whatever they like and face the consequences thereof. If we are in a position to make them suffer the consequences, their only fortitude is that they are not made to suffer the consequences. Otherwise, the Government of India, their spokesmen, Ministerial spokesmen could not have said, "If we accept the principles of the Dunkel Draft in the matter of medicine, we may be at the receiving end at the beginning. But ultimately we will get cheap medicine. On what ground they said it, has never been cleared. Regarding seeds, if that patent clause remains there, what will be the position of India? Nobody knows that. What benefit will we derive by being a member of GATT? That is also not clear. I am not sure that EC has no interest in GATT or the USA has no interest in GATT or Japan has no interest in GATT. In that case, all of them would not haveliked that Draft to be according to their own liking, the way they liked it to be finalised, updated, finally formulated on the 15th December. There is every doubt that even on the 15th it would not be finalised because there are conflicting interest of the developed countries The question of interests of developing countries really would not matter either with the Dunkel Draft or with GATT. They care a straw for us, for the developing countries. If we are also

developed, in that case, of course, may God help us. Therefore, the one thing that is important is that on the side of the Government there should be a categorical announcement, an announcement regarding regarding the policy of the Government on the Dunkel Draft and the reasons behind each issue should be very categorically stated. They should be prepared as Prof. Swell said, to face the consequences there of. There should not be this equivocation—I might have said that, I might not have said that—nothing like that. It should be a straightforward formulation regarding the Dunkel Draft. It goes without saying that it was not prepared with an eye to the developing country's interest. Dunkel prepared a compromise draft to just see that the conflicting interests of the developing countries through different zones, through different areas, all these conflicts, are resolved with a compromise. This draft is really that sort of a compromise in the interest of the developed countries. What benefit developing countries can take of th draft, it is for the Minister to explain when he moves for its acceptance. If he wants to go to the final meeting with the backing of Parliament's blessing, he will have to clearly explain as to what are the issues on which he will lend his support to the Dukel Draft. Even the Minister is on re-record for havig said different things regarding differet aspects of the Dunkel Draft. Such ambiguity should not be there, should not be allowed to remain there and should be clarified by all means. In doing that the question of the interest of the country definitely must be foremost. He will be judged on that yardstick of national interest—whether it will benefit the general people of the country the traders, the commercial people and others. From that aspect he will have to explain it. Thank you.

**उपसभाध्यक्ष** : श्री भूपेन्द्र सिंह मान। आप सात मिनिट बोल लीजिये।

**श्री भूपेन्द्र सिंह मान** : (नाम निर्देशित) मैडम, इस वक्त की सबसे बड़ी कंट्रोवर्सी जो कि डंकल प्रपोजल की चल रही है दुनिया में उसके संबंध में आपने सात मिनिट का समय दिया है फिर भी शुक्रिया। मैडम, इस मुद्दे को कहीं से भी देखा जा सकता है – चाहे व्यापार से देख लें या इनवेस्टमेंट से देख लें- बौद्धिक अधिकार से देख लें या एग्री कल्चर की साइड से देख लें, मैं इसको एग्रीकल्चर की साइड से देखते हुये यह आपसे यह कहना चाहता हूं कि एग्री-कल्चर में डकल टैक्स्ट में एक चैप्टर है "एल" जिसमें कि एनेक्श्चर्स सरकार को "गैट" में देने होते हैं। मैडम, मेर हाथ में एक कापी है जोकि कामर्स मिनिस्ट्री की तरफ से "गैट" में 20 दिसम्बर, 1991 को दी गयी है। उसको देखकर मुझे हैरानी होती है और मैं तो समझता हूं सारे देश को इसमें हैरानी से आगे जाकर चिंता का विषय होना चाहिये कि सारा टी0वी0 माध्यम प्रचार करता है कि किसानों को सब्जिडीज दी जा रही है। अब पार्लियामेंट में यह कहना शुरू कर दिया गया है कि यहां 5..2 प्रतिशत की पार्जिटिव सब्सिडी है जबकि इस डाक्यूमेंट में जोकि उरग्वे राउंड के लिये जेनेवा में मिनिस्ट्री की तरफ से दिया गया है, उसमें यह कहा गया है कि 17 चीजें हैं खेती की, जिनके लिये सबसिडि केलकुलेट की गई है। इन 20 में से 3 चीजें छोड़ी गई हैं और जो

17 ली गई हैं, उनमें से एक-एक को देखें, तो जैसे अगर राइस को लें तो निगेटिव सबसिडि है 6,183.3 करोड़ की, अगर गेहूं को लिया जाय तो उसमें निगेटिव सबसिडि है 4,183.9 करोड़ की। ऐसे लेते-लेते यह टोटल निगेटिव सबसिडि जो है, वह है 17,092.1 करोड़ रुपये, जो इन सारी 17 चीजों के ऊपर हैं। इनकी जो पैदावार है, इनकी कोस्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन, इनकी वेल्यू आफ एग्रीकल्चर आउटपुट जो लगाई गई है, जो कलकुलेट की गई है वह बनती है 34,638 करोड़ रुपये यानि 34,638 करोड़ रुपये की खेती की 17 चीजों की पैदावार के ऊपर अगर निगेटिव सबससिडि 17,092.1 करोड़ बनती है तो यह 50 परसेंट निगेटिव सबसिडि है इन 17 चीजों के ऊपर।

मैडम, मैं कामर्स मिनिस्टरी की केलकुलेशन को ठीक करना चाहता हूं। इनके हिसाब में कोई गड़बड़ हुई है, जब इन्होंने कहा कि 5.20 परसेंट सबसिडि हम दे रहे हैं। वास्तव में इन्होंने लिया यह टोटल एग्रीकल्चर आऊटपुट, जो 1986-89 का है। यह 1986-89 का एग्रीकल्चर आऊट पुट 1113,225 करोड़ रुपए जो होती है उसके ऊपर डिवाइड कर दिया है। अगर 1113,225 करोड़ पर डिवाइड करते हैं तो यह सारी सबसिडी 5.2 परसेंट आती है जैसा कि यह ट्रेण्ड है इन 20 वस्तुओं में, जिसमें से 17 ली गई हैं, अगर सारा लिया जाए तो 50 प्रतिशत निगेटिव सबसिडी का होना, यह देश के लिए देखने वाली बात है क्योंकि निगेटिव सबसिडी तो कहीं नहीं है। हम अमरीका की बात करते है 26 परसेंट की, हम जापान की बात करते हैं पोजिटिव 70 परसेंट की, हम और देशों की बात करते हैं, जो पोजिटिव सब सिडि दे रहे हैं और यहां 50 परसेंट निगेटिव सबसिडी होते हुए आप उसको 5.2 कहने की बात करते हैं, जो कि ठीक नहीं है। यह केलकुलेशन हमें ठीक करनी चाहिए और देश को बिल्कुल सही बताना चाहिए कि क्या-क्या है।

अब निगेटिव सबसिडि, किसानों के ऊपर टैक्स, इस दिशा से होती है कि इस तरह की चीजें, मिसाल के तौर पर मैं बताऊंगा कि निगेटिव कसे, यह एक व्हीट के ऊपर एलिजिबिल प्रोडक्शन है 1986-89, तीन सालों की 48.20 मिलियन टन, उनमें एक्सटर्नल रेफरेन्स प्राइस है 2614 पर मीट्रिक टन, जबकि एडमिनिस्टर्ड प्राइस जो है वह है 1740/- रुपए पर मीट्रिक टन। तो देश में जो निगेटिव सबसिडी आती है, जो सरकार ने पैसे किसानों को देने चाहिए थे, जो दबाकर रखे वह बनते हैं 4183.9 करोड़ रुपए। इस दिशा से चलते हुए जब मैं देखता हूं तो पाता हूं कि हम इस निगेटिव सबसिडी में फंसे हुए हैं।

इस वक्त जो डंकल प्रोपोज़ल है, वह कहता है कि किसानों के ऊपर यह प्रतिबंध नहीं हो सकता। इसलिए मैं समझता हूं, क्योंकि डंकल प्रोपोज़ल में कहा गया है कि किसानों से कंपलसरि प्रोक्योरमेंट नहीं किया जाएगा, कंपलसरि प्रोक्योरमेंट करने से किसानों को नुकसान होता है, कंपलसरि प्रोक्योरमेंट करने से किसानों को निगेटिव सबसिडि में नीचे दबना होता है। अभी सवालों के समय भी एक सवाल आया था कि गांव में बैंक क्यों घाटे में चल रहे हैं? अब जब सारा इलाका ही घाटे में चल रहा हो तो बैंक वहां के मुनाफे में कैसे चल सकते हैं? इस वक्त गांव की जिस दिशा में उनकी इकोनोमी स्क्वीज की जा रही है, उस दिशा में देखते हुए कंपलसरि प्रोक्योरमेंट नहीं हो सकती। इसमें यह भी कहा गया है कि लेवी प्रोक्योरमेंट नहीं हो सकता। मैं समझता हूं, यह अच्छी बात है, देश के हित में है, इसमें प्रोडक्शन बढ़ेगा किसानों को उनकी मेहनत का दाम मिलेगा और इसलिए इसका हम सभी को स्वागत करना चाहिए।

यहां तक हमारे यहां यह था कि एक प्रांत से दूसरे प्रांत तक हम एग्रीकल्चर प्रोड्यूस को नहीं ले जा सकते थे। पिछले साल मैं आपको कहता रहा कि मैं अपने घर से अपने ट्रेक्टर ट्राली के ऊपर गेहूं लादकर ला रहा था महाराष्ट्र में बेचने के लिए और मुझे गिफ्तार कर लिया, रोका गया, वह प्रिविलेज मोशन आपके हाथ में

पड़ा है, पता नहीं उसके ऊपर क्या होता है क्या नहीं होता । तो यह सरकार ऐसे जो गैर कानूनी रुकावटें डाल रही थी, इसमें यह कहा गया है कि यह किसानों के ऊपर ऐसी रुकावटें नहीं डालेगी । यहां तक कि एक्सपोर्ट करने के ऊपर रुकावट नहीं होगी। यहां तक इसमें यह भी है कि जब किसानों की उपज कम प्रोडक्शन की हो, उस समय भी नहीं रोक सकते । जैसे डिमांड और सप्लाई के संबंध में होता है, तो अगर किसी चीज को जब भी चाहो खोल दो बाहर भेजने के लिए और जब चाहे खोल दो बाहर से आने के लिए, तो यह प्रोडक्शन के हित में नहीं होता । इसी दिशा में निगेटिव सब-सिडी अगर देखें तो काटन के ऊपर 206 प्रतिशत निगेटिव सबसिडी वाले जो किसान पैदा कर रहे हैं, वे कैसे बढ़ा सकते हैं । हम इंटरनेशनल मार्किट में जब कम्पीट करें तो हमें खुली व्यवस्था चाहिए, काम करने के लिए, आगे बढ़ने के लिए खुली हवा चाहिए । ऐसे ही इसमें यह कहा गया है, इस टक्सूट में यह कहा गया है कि सबसिडीज नहीं होंगी किसानों के लिए, हमें नहीं चाहिए ऐसी सबसिडीज जो 50 परसेंट सबसिडीज निगेटिव है : निगेटिव सबसिडी इस तरह है, 50 परसेंट टक्स, इन्कम टकस जो लोग देते हैं उससे कहीं ज्यादा है । इसलिए यह जो कहा गया है, यह अच्छी बात है कि हमें अपनी मेहनत का दाम चाहिए । इसी दिशा में जाते हुए इसमें जब एक कंट्रोवर्सी की बात आती है कि किसानों को सीड नहीं उनका रखने दिया जाएगा, तो मैं समझता हूं कि इस वक्त देश में जो मल्टी नेशनल सीड बेच रहे हैं, इस वक्त भी सीड भेजने वाले मल्टी नेशनल हैं, उनकी दो दुकानें हैं और वे नहीं चाहते कि तीसरी दुकान खुले, चौथी या पांचवीं दुकान खुले । मैं चाहता हूं कि मेरे पास चॉयस होनी चाहिए । इस वक्त बाजार में दो दुकानें हैं मल्टी नेशनल की और अगर पांच या दस दुकानें खुलती हैं तो मेरे पास चॉयस है। अगर मैंने इंटर-नेशनल मार्किट में कोई वस्तु बेचनी है तो मुझे उसकी क्वालिटी चाहिए, उसका स्टेंडर्ड चाहिए, इंटरनेशनल मार्किट में बेचने के लिए इंटर-नेशनल कंजूमर को जो चाहिए, वह मुझे पैदा करना है और उसके लिए मेरा अधिकार है कि मैं सीड कहां से लेता हूं । मैंने यह कहीं नहीं देखा । ठीक है, प्रचार हो रहा है, अखबारों में अपनी-अपनी तरफ से किया जा रहा है लेकिन इस टैक्सूट में कहां लिखा हुआ है कि किसान को अपना सीड नहीं रखने दिया जाएगा । कोई ऐसा प्रावधान नहीं है कि किसान को अपना सीड रखने के ऊपर रुकावट है । तो इस दिशा में इस वक्त तक जो पेरासाइटिक एटीचयूड देश में चलता रहा है, वह किसान को आज ही बहकाकर और किसान के कंधे पर बंदूक रखकर, जो किसान की आजादी आ रही है, वह आजादी को रोकना चाहता है । मैं समझता हूं कि किसान ऐसा नहीं होने देंगे, देश को ऐसा नहीं होने देना चाहिए । इस वक्त तक तो गांव गुलाम बना बैठा है । इस वक्त तक अगर मैं मोटे तौर पर कहूं तो शहर का गांव गुलाम बना बठा है और इस गुलामी को तोड़ने के लिए ठीक है देश ने कुछ नहीं किया किसान आन्दोलन हमेशा यह कहता रहा है कि हमारे ऊपर लेवी नहीं चाहिए, हमारे प्रिक्योरमेंट ऐसी कम्प्लसरी नहीं चाहिए, हमें फ्री दो, हम काम करना चाहते हैं, प्रोडक्शन बढाना चाहते हैं, लेकिन देश ऐसी नीतियां अपनाता रहा जिससे प्रोडक्शन बढ नहीं सकती थी, कम होती गई । यहां तक कि अंदर-खाते यह कहा जाता रहा है कि हमें प्रोडक्शन बढाने की चिंता नहीं है, प्रोडक्शन को कसे कंज्यूम करना है, इसकी चिंता है । तो जब देश इस दिशा में सोच रहा हो तो मैं यह समझता हूं कि हमें यह भी देखना चाहिए कि नेशनलिस्टिटक, नेशनलिज्म, वह क्या जो पारासाइट सोचने वाले हैं, वह जो देश का नुकसान करने वाले हैं, वह सोचने वाले होंगे कि देश कौन होता है ? मैं समझता हूं कि यह चोरों को, देश के विरोधियों को, जिन्होंने आज तक प्रोडक्शन नहीं बढने दिया, जिन्होंने आज तक पेररासाइटिक एटीच्यूड रखा, खून निचोड़ने वाली बात रखी यह जो ब्यूरोक्रेटिक है, यह जो इस वक्त कराधन वाले हैं, यह जो इस वक्त नेता दलालगिरी यहां पर लाइसेंसों की, परमिटों की, कोटों की करते हैं, उनका एटीच्यूड, यह सारे जो एटीच्यूड हैं, फ्रोनस में न तो करप्शन रहेगी, न दलाली कोटे और परमिटों की रहेगी और किसानों को बाहर आने-जाने में उसको,

चीज बेचने में कोई कोई प्रतिबंध नहीं रहेगा। इसलिए मैं समझता हूं कि सारे देश को इसका स्वागत करना चाहिए। कंज्यूमर के हित में है कि मार्किट खुली हो। आज तक तो सारी मोनोप्लिस्टिक मार्किट रही है। कौन सी हमारे देश में मार्किट रही है। आज तक बंद मार्किट में हम बैठे हुए। अगर मार्किट खुलने वाली बात हो तो हमें चाहिए कि खुली मार्किट हो, इस वक्त की मोनोपली तोड़कर हमें अच्छी हवा आना चाहिए। इस वक्त जो मल्टी नेशनल का विरोध करने वाली बात करते है, तो मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि कौन सी ऐसी चीज है जो मल्टी नेशनल की नहीं है। हम सभी हवाई जहाजों में उड़ान भरते है। तो क्या हम पैदल चलकर जाते हैं? तो जो मल्टी नेशनल के विरोध की बात करते है, वे वास्तव में अपना इंटरेहस्ट बचाना चाहते हैं, अपनी खुदगर्जी की बात करते है। उसको हमें तोड़ना चाहिए, उसको पीछे पछाड़ना चाहिए और देश को आगे बढाने के लिए कार्य करें। देश का प्रोडक्शन तभी बढ़ सकता है अगर प्रोडक्शन बढ़ाने के लिए प्रोड्यूशर को ताकत दी जाए, प्रोड्यूशर को आगे बढ़ाने का मौका दिया जाय, न कि जो प्रोड्यूशर का खून चूसने वाले हैं, उनको मौका दिया जाए। आज तक प्रोड्यूशर का खून चूसने वाले ब्लकमार्केटियर, इन-एफिसिएंट लोग ही आगे बढ़ते रहे हैं। मैं चाहूंगा कि इसमें एफिसिएंसी को बढ़ावा देने वाली बात कही गई है और हम सभी को कंज्यूमर के हित में जो यह खुली हवा, खुला मंच, देश का खुला वायु मंडल है, इसकी सराहना करनी चाहिए। (समय की घंटी) यह तो किसान आंदोलन हमेशा से बीस सालों से ऐसा कहते आए हैं। इसलिए मैं तो यह समझता हूं कि डंकल ने वह कहा जो किसान आंदोलन कहता रहा है। किसान आंदोलन जब कहता था तो देश में किसी ने नहीं सुना। आज डंकल ने कहा है तो सारे सुनने के लिए तैयार हैं और वह बात हो रही हैं। चलो, डंकल की बात सुन कर ही हम खुली हवा में चलें। मैं समझता हूं कि इसका हमें स्वागत करना चाहिए। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं। (धन्यवाद)

**उपसभापति** : नौनिहाल सिंह जी, आप पांच मिनट बोलिएगा।

डा. **नौनिहाल सिंह** (उत्तर प्रदेश) : बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद डिप्टी चेयर पर्सन, हालांकि डंकल प्रस्ताव के ऊपर ज्यादा समय मिलना चाहिए था। खास तरीके से जो खेती और किसान की बात है, जो माननीय श्रीमान जी ने कही हैं, मैं उन सब बातों से सहमत हूं। खेती से ही अनाज पैदा होता है जिससे हमारी जीविका चलती है और खेती से ही कच्चा माल पैदा होता है जिससे कल-कारखाने चलते हैं। सारे देश की धुरी तो खेती है और खेती पर ही डंकल प्रस्ताव का सबसे ज्यादा प्रभाव हो रहा है। मगर सरकार इस बात की बिल्कुल परवाह न करके जल्दी से जल्दी इसके लिए हां कर देना चाहती है। इसका किसान पर, खेती पर बहुत ही भयंकर असर होगा और जैसा मैंने कहा कि किसान सारे देश की धुरी है। तो सारे देश पर बहुत ही भयंकर असर होगा, हर पहलू से देदेश के ऊपर असर हो जाएगा। बहुत पुरानी हमारी कहावत है कि--"उत्तम खेती मध्यम बान, करे चाकरी भीख समान।' खेती सबसे उत्तम कार्य माना जाता है। खेती हमारे जीवन और सारे देश का आधार है। हमारे किसान के लिए खेती केवल पेट भरने का साधान नहीं है, बल्कि एक साधना है। हमारे किसान खेती को एक ईश्वर और देश का कार्य

मानते हैं। अगर माता और पुत्र के सदियों पुराने इस संबंध पर कोई कुठाराघात करता है तो यह मानना चाहिए कि यह षड्यंत्र केवल भारत के किसान के विरोध में न होकर भारत की अस्मिता, उसके प्रबल, प्रखर तेजोमय स्वरूप को नष्ट करने का प्रयास है। भारतीय किसान को उसकी भूमि से अलग करने का एक प्रस्ताव जो नेहरू जी सहकारी खेती के नाम से रूस से लेकर आए थे, उसका सारे देश में बहुत ही भयंकर तरीके से विरोध किया गया और वह प्रस्ताव खत्म हो गया तथा वह माना नहीं गया। अब यह दूसरा एक तरीका है इस देश को खत्म करने का, खराब करने का कि खेती के ऊपर डंकल प्रस्ताव का असर हो।

किसान का खेत में नीम, गाय, भैंस, बछिया, बैल और बिटोरा पर मालिकाना अधिकार है। यही उसका प्राण है, इसी में उसका ईश्वर है। डंकल प्रस्ताव द्वारा उसकी भूमि, खेत पौधे, जानवरों से अलग करने का एक जाल रचा जा रहा है। डंकल प्रस्ताव के जरिए विदेशी ताकतें अपनी गिद्ध दृष्टि भारत की कृषि पर लगाए हुए हैं। अभी तक भारत की खेतीबाड़ी कितनी सजगता से थी और इसीलिए हमारे खाद्यान्न के फील्ड में हमको बहुत अच्छे तरीके से तरक्की मिली। यदि भारतीय खेती ही गुलाम हो गई तो जरूरी बात है कि हमारे सारे देश की जितनी भी व्यवस्था है यानी यहां तक कहें कि हमारे फाइनेंसियल रिफार्म्स जो हैं, वह भी खराब हो जाएंगे। दुख यह है कि केन्द्रीय शासन इस डंकल प्रस्ताव के सामने झुका जा रहा है।

म०प० 1.00

क्योंकि 85 बिलियन डालर से ज्यादा का कर्जा लेकर विदेशी ताकतों की बातें माननी पड़ी रही है। यदि भारत सरकार ने यह डंकल प्रस्ताव स्वीकार कर लिया तो संसद भी उसमें कोई तब्दीली नहीं कर सकेगी, ये बात जान लेनी चाहिये। ऐसे हालात में खेती ही नहीं, उससे जुड़ी हुई चीजें, खाद, बीज, बैल, पेड़, पौधे आदि सब पर अधिकार बहुराष्ट्रीय कम्पनियों का हो जायेगा। किसान एक मजदूर या गुलाम होकर रह जायेगा। अमरीकी पेटेंट कानून लागू होते ही किसान अपने खेत से बीज पैदा नहीं कर सकेगा हर साल किसान को विदेशी कम्पनियों से महंगे दामों पर बीज खरीदने पड़ेंगे। अपने खेत से पैदा किये बीज को बोने के लिये किसान को पेटेंट वाली कम्पनी को फीस देनी पड़ेगी, अधिकार शुल्क देना पड़ेगा जिसको रायल्टी कहते हैं। कम्पनी को बिना रायल्टी दिये यदि किसान अपने खेत का बीज बो लेगा तो उस पर मुकदमा चलेगा और मुकदमे वाली बात इतनी खराब है कि विदेशी कम्पनियों के एजेंट यहां होंगे और मामूली-मामूली बात पर बाकायदा नोटिस देंगे और मुकदमे चलेंगे और मुकदमेबाजी से किसान और तबाह हो जायेगा।

इसलिये मेरा इस हाउस से आह्वान है और सारे देश के किसानों और नौजवानों से आह्वान है और उद्योग पतियों से आह्वान है कि इस डंकल प्रस्ताव को किसी तरह से पास न होने दें और सरकार को मंजूरी न देने दें वरना देश का पतन हो जायेगा जैसे पहले पतन हुआ था ईस्ट इंडिया कम्पनी के आने के बाद। इसी तरह से डंकल प्रस्ताव को मानने के बाद इस देश का अवश्य ही पत्तन हो जायेगा और वह गुलामी में आ जायेगा और अगर हम इस बात की तरफ ध्यान नहीं देंगे तो आने वाली जनता भी हमको कहेगी कि हमने देश को बहुत बड़ा धोखा दिया है। इसलिये मेरा इस सदन के मेंबरान से आह्वान है कि वे अपने दिल को टटोलें, अपने दिल और दिमाग की शक्तियों में इस को किसी तरह से पास न होने दें।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr Minister.

SHRI SOMAPPA R. BOMMAI (Orissa): Madam, before the Minister commences his reply, instead of seeking clarifications or making a speech, I would like to know one point. How many countries have already agreed for these proposals and terms, apart from India? I would like to point out that a sub-committee was formed under the Chairmanship of the HRD Miniser, and the other Ministers are also there, where all the political parties were asked to give their views on the subject. We all went and submitted our views. And it was said that the leaders of all the political parties would be called for a discussion. And that has not been done. I want to know whether the Minister would do it. Thirdly, the Standing Committee on Commerce discussed these Dunkel proposals. Has it submitted a report?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No.

SHRI SOMAPPA R. BOMMAI: And if it has not submitted, I want to know whether the Minister will take the view of the Standing Committee into consideration.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE (SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE): Madam Deputy Chairperson, I am grateful to the hon. Members who have participated and made very valuable contributions by analysing and exchanging their views on the proposals contained in what is known as the Dunkel Draft Text and which is the basis for conclusion of the Uruguay Round of discussions and negotiations. At the same time, through you, Madam, I would like to express my regret to the hon. Members that physically I could not remain present and listen to their speeches which the parliamentary etiquette demands. But I had no option because the debate simultaneously began in the other House. So, I had to remain present there also, But, nonetheless, I express my regret for that.

Madam, I would first like to clarify one position because a large number of Members referred to it as to why we brought the discussion on the Dunkel Draft Text on the 6th and 7th of December, when 15th December is going to be the concluding day of negotiations. I would like to clarify the position. For the last two years, since the submission of the Dunkel Draft Text, we had sent communications from the Ministry as many as seventeen times to both the Houses for raising a discussion on these proposals. Unfortunately, Madam, it did not come up. As a Member of this House, I share my anguish with others that we did not find time to discuss it.

I had the privilege of being the Leader of this House for five years. For serious issues like this, we always used to give time. On this issue also, it was the collective responsibility of the leaders of the various groups, including the Government side, to allocate time. Unfortunately, we could not do it. Nonetheless, it is not correct to say that it was not discussed here. Even just a

[Shri Parnab Mukherjee]

year ago, on the last day of the previous Winter Session, a debate on this issue was raised here. Of course, it was inconclusive. It was raised through a Private Members' Resolution also. Therefore, it is not correct to say that it was a lapse on the part of the Government not to have brought forward this issue. Because of certain factors on which I would not like to make my comments, the House did not find time to debate it, to discuss it.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Madam, I would like to state, on behalf of the opposition, that we had always pressed for it. But the Government always thought of bringing it on the last day of each Session. I would say that it was a case of stage-managed lapse on the part of the Government.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jaipal Reddy, I have been a witness to this. I know. This matter was discussed in the Business Advisory Committee many times.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Please don't give any judgement.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am not giving any judgement. I have been a witness. Many times in the Business Advisory Committee this issue was raised by Members and the Government also said that they did not have any objection. But you know and I know. There were many pressing problems and issues because of which we could not take it up. Let us not accuse each other. The fact is that we have taken it up on the first day of this Session. That is the importance of it.

एक माननीय सदस्य : मैडम, यह तो. . . . (व्यवधान)

उपसभापति : बैठ जाइए, आपकी आदतें खराब हो गई हैं कि चेयर से कोई बोल रहा हो तो आप भी खड़े हो जाते हैं। मैं बता रही हूं कि फैक्ट्स हैं

which you do not know, but I know. It is better you do not interrupt.

विपक्ष के नेता (श्री सिकंदर बख्त) : सदर साहिबा, मिनिस्टर साहब की तरफ से बड़ा सरकास्टिक इल्जाम लगा कि अपोजिशन रुकावट डालता रहा है। मैं कहना यह चाहता हूं कि यह रूख देना अपनी तकरीर को गलत है।

†[نیبا وروده‌ی دل (شری سکندر بخت) : صدر صاحبه - منسٹر صاحب کی طرف سے بڑا سرکاسٹک الزام لگا که اپوزیشن روکاوٹ ڈالتا رها هے - میں کہنا چاهتا هوں که یه روخ دینا اپنی تقریر کو غلط هے -]

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Madam, most respectfully, I would like to submit that there is a communication gap. Mr, Bommai raised the issue. This was the point I was going to raise right now. When the debate remained inconclusive on the last day of the previous Winter Session, a commitment was given by my colleague, by my predecessor, that we would discuss it with the leaders of the various political parties.

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR (Uttar Pradesh): Lok Sabha.

†[ ] Transliteration in Arabic Script.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I am not talking of the Lok Sabha or the Rajya Sabha. I am talking of the various political parties. I myself invited the leaders of all the political parties including the party presided over by Shri Bommai and no less a person than...

SHRI G. G. SWELL: I never got the invitation.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN (Tamil Nadu): The A.I.A.D.M.K. did not get the invitation.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. We are not starting any discussion on this.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: Madam, he said that he had sent invitations. As leader of the A.I.A.D.M.K., I did not get any invitation.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Mr. Padmanabham attended it.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: Mr. Padmanabham represents the Telugu Desam. I represent the A.I.A.D.M.K.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: In fact, all the major political parties.. (*Interruptions*) I am not yielding, Mr. Bommai. Madam, they have raised certain issues and I have to reply to them. (*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Swell, please sit down.

SHRI G. G. SWELL: We are all equal Members. Nobody is major and nobody is minor.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: There is no question of major or minor. I am stating a fact. Mr. Bommai raised the question.

SHRI G. G. SWELL: I did not get any invitation.

SHR PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Mr. Bommai raised the question whether leaders of all the political parties were invited or not. My answer is 'Yes'. From his party, Prof. Madhu Dandavate and others joined in the discussion.

SHRI G. G. SWELL: Madam, object. I was never invited.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: The second question is... (*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, I am not opening a dscussion Please take your seat. Mr. Bommai, my request to you, please take your seat and let the Minister complete his reply.

SHRI SOMAPPA R. BOMMAI: Let the Minister not mislead the Hou

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: There is no question of misleading the House. (*Interruptions*). I am not yielding. My point is that I invited the leader of the Janata Party.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY (Uttar Pradesh): He is not in Janata Party. He has left Janata Party.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I invited the leaders of the CPI, CPM, Forward Block and others.

SHRI G. G. SWELL: They never invited me.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: They just responded to my invitation. (*Interruptions*). I am sorry, I did not know which party he represented. Otherwise, I would have surely invited him.

SHRI G. G. SWELL: I object to this.

SHRI SOMAPPA R. BOMMAI: I have raised a point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. It will look as if you do not want the reply. (*Interruptions*). What is you point of order?

SHRI SOMAPPA R. BOMMAI: Let me explain.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: This way I do not know how to reply. I have every right to reply to the points which they have raised. If they do not want to listen, I have no objection. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI G. G. SWELL: In what way you are superior, tell me. I object to this. (*Interruptions*). I am superior to anyone of you. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI SOMAPPA R. BOMMAI: Madam, I agree with the Minister... (*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No cross-talk.

SHRI G. G. SWELL: I have come here not on the mercy of anybody. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI S. K. T. RAMACHANDRAN (Tamil Nadu): Why should he unnecessarily think that he is small?

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA (Bihar): Is any superior party registered with Parliament? He is leader of 'superior party'?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I request the Members to be very serious. It is a serious matter. Do not take it so lightly. It is an issue to which the Minister is replying. You all cooperated yesterday and today. We took it as the first thing after the Question Hour instead of special mentions. I request all of you to please sit down and let the Minister speak.

SHRI SOMAPPA R. BOMMAI: Let me explain. Madam, it is a very important matter. Otherwise, I do not speak in the House.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: But he has not read the Dunkel report.

SHRI SOMAPPA R. BOMMAI: Let Mr. Swamy cease to be childish in the House.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: You have not read the Dunkel report. It is clear from your speech.

SHRI SOMAPPA R. BOMMAI: We had written to the Ministry one and half years back. We were insisting for a discussion. The Minister is right. He invited the political parties with a short notice of 2 days when were busy with election campaign. Is it the way to discuss such report in a hurry? Why did he not invite us a year or six months back?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him answer.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Mr. Bommai is totally misunderstanding. It was done sometime in April when there was no question of election. Prof. Dandavate had attended and we had a full-fledged discussion. You please check up from Prof. Dandavate. He represented your party. I hope he represents your party. He attended and he dd not raise the question that he had come on a short notice. We had differences of opinion. We have different perception. No less persons than Shri Surjeet, Shri Sitaram Yechuri, Shri Inderjit Gupta came. We shared. It is not that we agreed but we had a discussion and we shared our perception. This is the limited point which I wanted to make.

(THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN) IN THE CHAIR)

Therefore, it is not correct to say that it was not discussed.

Now, another point which I would like to clarify is—this is also important—what would happen on 15th December and what would be the scenario after that? Before I come to the substantive part of the debate on 15th December it is true, if everything goes as per the present schedule, the negotiating committee which was meeting and discussing, that stage will be over. Therefore around April, there will be another

ministerial round of discussions of course, not major, substantive, discussions but how to ratify it. Thereafter, one full year will be given to various sovereign contracting parties to finalize and to take their decisions whether they are going to ratify it or not. Therefore, 15th December had its significance—there is no doubt about it but the question is that everything is not going to be completed and it is for every country, every contracting party, to decide whether they will join it or not. Even if you join, by giving a notice of six months you can come out of it. Whether you will come out or not, whether coming out of it will be in the larger interests or not, that is a different issue. But, so far as the technicalities are concerned, this is the position which I would like to clarify.

Now, coming to the point, one basic issue was raised...

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA (Bihar): One point, Mr. Mukherjee.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: No, I am not yielding.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATRAJAN): Please let him complete.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: Because he is raising... (*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): Please let the Minister complete.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I cannot have a running discussion. I am prepared to sit and give any clarification you want after that. But it is not proper that when I am on my legs somebody will get up and say, "I want a clarification." I am not yielding.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: He said... (*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): Chatuananji, let him finish. Then you can seek it, please... (*Interruptions*)....

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: He has raised this question that one full year is there....

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I am not, simply, yielding... (*Interruptions*)... This debate cannot go on in this way. I will not answer your question. I am not yielding. (*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): Let the hon. Minister complete, please.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: This type of interruption I do not know: I am not a newcomer to this House. You do not allow me to complete even one sentence. What type of courtesy is this?

Therefore, the substantive question which has been raised is, why we expand the discipline of GATT? It is true, as some of the Members have pointed out, that the earlier GATT related to trade in goods, tariff matters, what happened and why TRIMS TRIPS, trade related investment matters, trade-related intellectual property rights, trade in services were brought within the GATT discipline. Here I would like to tell the hon. Members what happened after the Tokyo round of discussions in 1976 and the traditional position which India took since then. It was agreed that unless the pending issues of the Tokyo round of discussions were sorted out, no ministerial level discussions will take place. Unfortunately, when the ministerial level discussions started taking place in September 1986 at Punta del Este, then the developed countries took one position that all matters including services, TRIPS and TRIMS should be brought within the discipline of GATT. Some of the developing countries took a position that we should not agree to that. But, unfortunately, over the years, one after another the developing countries started succumbing to the pressures of the Big Powers. This is the hard-core reality. Like the ostrich we can keep our heads sunk in the sand and refuse to recognize reality, but it

(Shri Pranab Mukherjee)

doesn't help us. It happened. Yesterday somebody asked why India cannot take the lead. Just in last September, 88 developing countries, under the guidance and leadership of the President of Argentina, wrote to President Clinton, the Japanese Prime Minister and the British Prime Minister, John Major, saying let the Uruguay round of discussions be concluded without any change in the Dunkel Text itself. Madam, you will recognise, and the House will surely remember even in the last Commonwealth Summit a team was chosen to canvass for acceptance of the Dunkel Text as the basis of the conclusion of the Uruguay Round of disussions. This is the international scenario, and in this international scenario we shall have to work out our strategy. We cannot work in isolation.

I entirely agree with Prof. Swell when he says whether it is in our best interest to come out of GATT or to remain in GATT and to try to see to what extent we can get advantage out of that. The come out is easy. China came out in 1949. Today China is standing in the queue. The application of China for admission to GATT is pending since 1986. What happened? If we want to replace the multilateralism by bilateralism, what happens? China is the best example. Having much more economic power compared to India, having international trade of almost $ 130 to 140 billion and exports worth $ 64 to 70 billion, they had to change the patent law when they were threatened that their exports worth $ 24 billion to America would be jeopardised if they did not fall in line.

Just repeating rhetorics is of no use. What is our share in the world trade today? It is less than 1 per cent. I am not going into the debate about who is responsible and who is not responsible, but you can discuss about it. The hard, cold fact is, our total share in the international trade is less than 1 per cent. Can we influence worlds' trade bodies with this level of manoeuvrability. I am not going to influence the decision-making process of super powers, particularly with whom we have our trade relations. Our biggest trading partner is the EEC as a bloc, then the USA with around 16 per cent and Japan with around 12 per cent of our exports. Now the USA and Japan can well say, "I cannot deal with India. Let India take care of itself." But, can I say that I have no interest in exporting to the USA or to Japan? Therefore, if we do that, to what extent are we going to help our position and to what extent? Yes, it may be our wishful thinking that the developing countries should unite, but it is not going to happen. It is not there today: it has been there for the last ten years... (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): Kindly have the courtesy to let him complete. No interruptions will go on record. I am not allowing interruptions to go on record. Please sit down. Please sit down... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Even in the area of textiles, Madam, we have a very strong position. I myself, in my written statement, while introducing this subject, said that I was not happy, that I was disappointed. It is going on not this time only. This is the Eighth Round of negotiations. It was one of the items of the Tokyo Round of discussions in 1976, seventeen years ago, but what could the developing countries do? They could not take even a united position. Except Pakistan nobody else is supporting us. This is very simple. In international agreements we are not there to make charity for others. Each and every country is interested in preserving its own interest. Now, if some of the developing countries find that they

have larger access, they have larger quota and if MFA is integrated at the end of the tenth year— I am sharing with the House that I myself have a doubt. I raised the issue with the Director General, GATT, that you are saying integration will take place to the extent of 51 per cent in the ten years and suddenly at the eleventh year integration of balance 49 per cent will take place—that integration is a bit doubtful and is not acceptable to me. At that point of time developed countries may come and raise the issue that it is simply not possible in one year to have integration to the extent of almost half. Therefore, again let there be extension of the period. That danger is there.

SHRI ASHOK MITRA (West Bengal): America is thinking of 15 years.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Fifteen years has not yet come. The threat is there. As per the information which we have received officially, this has not been tabled, but there is some sort of whisper or rumour that some arrangement was made when the NAFTA was voted by the Congress and the Senate that the textile lobby was putting pressure on their Administration that there should be some extension of textiles integration from ten years to fifteen years. But officially what what I have been told is that no such proposal has been tabled. Perhaps realising the mood of the developing countries it may not come. I am not quite sure if in two or three days it comes. But when it comes, our position is quite clear. We are demanding that we would like to calibrate it. If you have fifteen years transition period for textiles, let the same facility be extended to other TRIPS arrangements. To the extent you will integrate with textiles, to that extent integration in other matters should take place. That is our stated position and we are trying to get it. But I am not quite sure whether we will be able to get it because the international environment today is not very favourable for having the type of arrangements which we have. Otherwise, these matters should not have been brought within the discipline of GATT. It was outside the purview of GATT so long. The very fact that the world is emerging towards unipolarism, the very fact that various trading blocs are emerging as an alternative to multilateral arrangements and multilateral fora, should we not take note of these facts and work out a strategy? Therefore, my point is that I am not here to justify that everything that has been contained in the Text for official approval is beneficial to us. I am not saying that. Many of the provisions are not beneficial to us. But at the same time you shall have to take a balanced view, because your question is isolation. If you want to remain isolated, you are free to do. Sovereign countries have a right to do. But if you want to remain in the system and take advantages of it, you will have to find out what is the balance of advantages. Now I come to some of the major issues which some of the hon. Members have raised. I am happy that both Prof. Swell and Mr. Mann have clarified some of the issues in respect of the subsidies. Here, I would request the hon. Members even today—and I told the leaders of the Opposition parties when I had a meeting with them—that this is our set of calculations. According to our calculations we find that both the product specific and non-product specific subsidies which we are giving to the agricultural commodities is much below the threshold level of 10 per cent. It is around 5.2 per cent. Then the question comes that today it is less than the permissible thereshould level. What would happen in future? Are we binding ourselves that we should keep our subsidies level at a particular point? If the situation demands that we may have to raise the subsidies, what would happen? So far as the present

[Shri Pranab Mukherjee].

Agreement is concerned, Agricultural Agreement will remain in operation for a period of seven years. For this period of seven years, from whatever date it may be operative, from 1st January, 1995 or 1st January, 1996, whatever be the period, the seven years will be counted from the date of operation, say from 1-1-1995. The base year 1986-89, the calculation which we have tabled before the GATT Secretariat, is calculated in these base years. Any change at the level of subsidy in these base years— the three year period of 1986-87, 1987-88, 1988-89 will not be taken into account. Whatever has been determined there, can't be reopened in the seven year priod of opration. What would happen after seven years? At the end of the sixth year, every country will renogotiate. We will renegotiate from the position prevailed at that point of time. If the position prevailed at that point of time is not acceptable to you; and if it is not convenient for your own programme, you may not accept it.

The second question which is pertinent and somebody had raised it and myself also had raised it with the DG, GATT A confusion has arisen because of some language in a particular section of the text regarding purchase and sale even for the public distribution system will have to be made at the market price level. This question was raised and I had a discussion with the DG, GATT. Our negotiations have also raised this issue. Our point was very simple that the responsibility of feeding the 900 million people can't be left to any outside agency to supply food.

Therefore, on the concept of food security, we are not in a position to compromise in any way. No Government can do that. Even if they ask us to reduce our subsidies for the public distribution system, it is simply not accpetable to us. Secondly, how are they concerned? India is not going to play a major role in agricultural commodities in the coming few years. We are not going to generate that much surplus where we will distort the world trade by dumping subsidised foodgrains or subsidised agricultural products. We will continue to remain as a minor player for quite sometime. Therefore, how they are concerned whether we give some more subsidies or not.

They are talking of subsidies to production. How are subsidies given to the consumers through the PDS are to be covered by that? I am happy to inform you that the change in the language, in the text itself has been accepted an it will ensure that our concept of security, our PDS system is not going to be affected.

Then, coming to the question of BOP cover, there has been—I won't say misapprehension—some communication gap. What the Finance Minister has said, I even checked up with him — is that the balance of payments situation has improved from the level which it remained in 1991. But one can easily understand that we are having a debt of nearly dollar 80 million. With substantial improvement in the export figure in U.S. Dollar terms to the extent of 20 per cent, nonetheless there is a trade gap. The trade gap might have been reduced in the first seven months from dollar 200 million to dollar 600 million. But nonethless the trade gap is there. This is an illusion. This is an illusion because of the major import which takes place in the busy season from October to March and that is yet to be seen.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: Trade gap has not been mentioned.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I am not talking of that. I am talking of balance of payments position. Trade gap is one of the important elements in determining the BOP situation. The point which I am trying to drive at is even the foreign exchange reserves which we are having, even with the improvement of the reserves, debt servicing is always going to pose a serious problem and BOP cover is going to continue. How could you explain it?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: What was the criterion?

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Somebody had raised a question, "why is the IMF coming?' What is the charter of the IMF which was established in 1945? Is it not that so far as the payment is concerned, external payment is concerned, they are the determining factor? It is nothing new. Even in the Text, there is a provision that the IMF should be consulted. It is perfectly within the charter. Therefore, I would like to make it quite clear that there is no contradiction between what the Finance Minister indicated and what I am saying. So far as the BoP cover is concerned, it is going to continue. Even assuming, for the tsme being that there is no BoP cover, what is going to happen? Then what is the tariff-binding we have placed to protect our agriculture? What would be the tariff rate you will have? Is this level of tariff adequate to protect our agriculture or not? I am not taking into conideration the BoP cover. With this tariff rate, you tell me whether Indian agriculture will be fully protected or not. Primary agricultural products — 100 per cent; processed agricultural products — 150 per cent. and edible oils — 300 per cent. This is the tariff protection which we are providing (*Interruptions*)

Coming to the point of import access, raised by Mr. Chaturanan Mishra, firstly, I am saying that import access will not be available. We wil not have to provide any, import access so long as we are covered by BoP. Even assuming that the BoP cover will not be there, we are going to impose these levels of import duty. Just imagine, with these levels of import duty, how you are going to have it. This is the tariff-binding which we are having. Of course, there may be some import at some point of time when there is need. But the policy makers of the sovereign country will decide that.

Anothr question raised is whether we will have to make national legislations We have told them quite clearly that our PDS system is not covered by any national legislation. Our PDS system, since the late 40s or the early 50s, runs by administrative orders and we are not going to change that policy. Nobody is insisting on that. Most of the trading partners and other countries have agreed with us.

Coming to the point of Mr. Mann, if we take into account the domestic price and the international price-even assuming that changes have taken place after we usbmitted our list of calculations to GATT; there was some agreement between the USA and the EEC at Blairhouse —by clubbing product specifics and non-product specifics together, there too, we are finding that the subsidy which we are giving is in minus: about minus Rs. 19,000 crores. Therefore, I do not visualise the question of any obligation to reduce our subsidies to support our agricultural programmes.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: These calculations have not been made public by the Government. We do not know about the authenticity of thee calculations.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: The Standing Committee, of which his party man is the Chairman, should have informed him.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: That is why not only in the discussions with leader of political parties, but also in the discussions with a panel of expert on the television, I said I might be wrong. My figures might be wrong. You bring your own set of calculations. It was in the month of April that I said so. Not today. We wanted to have the discussions earlier. Parliament is supreme. Nobody can do anything other than what Parliament dictates. All the views are conidered by Parliament. It is not as if whatever we bring will be approved by it. If you gave your views they would have some—even if marginal-impact. That is why we wanted discussions earlier. Nonetheless, it did not happen. Now, coming to a couple of other

areas, I have already pointed out what would happen in respect of patenting of seeds. A question has been raised; if there is patenting, what would happen? As I have clarified on an earlier occasion, there is no compulsion on India to go in for patenting of seeds. We have the option of establishing... (*Interruption*) ...

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN (West Bengal): Madam, I am on a point of order. Are we going to have lunch?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): No; the Deputy Chairman has decided, if the House agrees, to allow the Minister to complete the reply and then have a break for lunch.

SHRI M. A. BABY (Kerala): But we may have to seek clarifications. ... (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I won't keep you hungry... (*Interruptions*) ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): One minute. (*Interruption*)... Excuse me. Let me answer. Mr. Baby, there is no procedure of seeking clarifications after the reply.

SHRI M. A. BABY: The Minister has agreed ... (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Let me finsh: after that if you have to sit and ... (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI M. A. BABY: What the Minister stated was, "We should not interrupt." And we appreciate...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): Mr. Baby, I am sitting in the Chair.

SHRI M. A. BABY: That is right.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI NATARAJAN): I might have to permit clarifications being asked.

SHRI M. A. BABY: Therefore, what I would suggest is that we can have a break, even a half-an-hour break.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): No; I am, of course, in the hands of the House but... (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Let me complete. I would like to make one submission. In the other House, the debate is taking place. So, I have to go to the other House. Madam, I humbly request the Members to bear with me and let me complete... (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI M. A. BABY: But, Madam, you should give us a guarantee that you will not immediately adjourn the House once the Minister completes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): I am entirely in the hands of the House. But there is no procedure like that. There is no procedure for seeking clarifications ...(*Interruptions*) ... No; we do not want to convert it into a debate. Let him finish. Then, I would see... (*Interruptions*) ..I will take the csonsensus as soon as he finishes.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: There is no compulsion on India to go in for patentjng of seeds... (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRIMATI CHANDDRIKA ABHANANDAN JAIN (Maharashtra): Maam, after the Minister finishes, we are going to have clarifiections.

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: There is no such convention in this House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): That is what I am telling Mr. Baby, that there is no procedure like that... (*Interruptions*) ... Chandrika, let him complete now. Let the Minister complete now ...(*Interruptions*)... Let the Minister conclude first...(*Interruptions*)... Mr. Baby, let him conclude. We will take a view later ...(*Interruptions*)... Mr. Jadhav, the Minister conclude. We wil take a view later. Let him finish now. We will take a view later.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: There is no compulsion on India to

go in for the patenting of seeds. We have the option of establishing an alternative system of protection of Plant Breeder's Rights which even under international conventions allow for the preservation of the farmer's right for using improved seeds harvested by him or future plantings and for undertaking non-commercial across the fence' exchange in a traditional manner. All that the farmer would be prevented from doing would be to undertake commercial sale of improved seed varieties which have been registered by the patenting authority in favour of Plant Breeders. Likewise, the right of researchers to use improve seed material for conducting further research will also remain safeguarded and will not suffer any erosion... (*Interruptions*)...

Regarding the question of making legislation, the House will get a full opportunity of examining and scrutinising the various provisions which will be included in the national legislation to safeguard their interests.

There is another area on which there has been agitation and there has been a debate and that is the patenting of drugs and our patent laws. It is true, if it is to be accepted, the 1970 Patent Law will not have much relevance. That is a fact. But you wil have to choose. Now what could we do? When USA withdrew the GSP and imposed a levy to the extent of 64 million dollars in the year 1992-93 on the Indian pharmaceutical products could we do anything? Is there any remedy available to us? When India was designated as priority country under Special 301, is there any remedy today? But if we go and if we accept the rule-based multinational fora and if we accept the dispute settlement mechanism as provided in these rounds of discussions, at least we will have one forum. You may succeed or you may not succeed, I don't know. But at least a forum will be made available to you. Therefore, it is.. (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: How can you compare it?

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: The whole issue is whether this Parliament is going to be consulted or not If this Parliament is not going to be concerned, then there is... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: These gentlemen are obsessed with the Dunkel Text. This is in the Dunkel Text. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: No, no. The question is whether this Parliament is going to be consulted or not. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: When I refer to the Blare House Agreement... (*Interruptions*).. It is not only the Dunkel Text. The Dunkel Texi is a preliminary text But there have been some changes, otherwise the question of Blate House Agreement would not have come otherwise, the formulation of DFA draft for find approval would not have come. That has provided the basis as Professor Swell or somebody has pointed out it i not the same. It has been amended. It may be minor. It may not be major. Nonetheless it has been amended. So we shall have to know what are these safeguards. There are two safeguards there. Instead of going into the details I would like to say one is the compulsory licensing machanism and the other is every sovereign Government would have the right to determine the price and resort to the price control mechanism which will be made available. But, of course, it will not be for commercial use. For non-commercial use, to support your health programme, if you want to have that mechanism, those facilities will be provided to you. To that extent the prices of commodities will be moderated. Yes, I don't rule out the possibility that there will be an enhancement. But to what extent it would be, that has to be seen. So far as the transition period is concerned, it is ten years.

So far as the pipeline protection which has been referred to is concerned, that is a matter on which we are also having serious discussion and we would like to see to what extent it is possible that the pipeline protection does not affect the interests of countries like ours. I think, in ease of patents granted by other countries but not patented here, applications kept in the black box will be given exclusive marketing rights by 2000 AD. If it is being applicable from 1st of January, 1995, I don't visualise any serious danger to it. But to some extent we will hove to live with the increase that may be there in the prices of some drugs and some pharmaceutical products.

The last point which I would like to deal with is... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: You are not replying to my question. (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: It is not my question. It is not my case that... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH (Maharashtra): Madam, this running commemary must stop. (*Interruptions*)... This is a new precedent. It has never happened before. The hon. Ministers have a right to complete their replies. After the reply was over if anybody wants to get up... (*Interruptions*)... it is incredible. (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I wonder what Mr. Chaturanan Mishra wants to drive at. (*Interruptions*)... I explained the position as to what would happen. The negotiating committee is going to conclude their job by 15th of December. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Will you sign? (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Where is the question of signing? (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: This is exactly what I was asking time and again. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: You will get one full year for ratification. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: So, I am asking you before ratifying it, are you going to consult with this Parliament or not? (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Who prevents you if you want? (*Interruptions*)... Who prevents you? (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI S JAIPAL REDDY: Will you make a commitment on behalf of the Government? (*Interruptions*)... Will you make a commitment on behalf of the Government? (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: You have priorities other than Dunkel. (*Interruptions*)... You have priorities other than important issues. (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Will you give an assurance? (*Interruptions*)... Mr. Minister will you give an assurance? (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I am not giving any assurance to any one. I am saying... (*Interruptions*)... It is not possible for me. (*Interruptions*)... I am not going to make any commitment. (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: No, no. Give an assurance (*Interruptions*)...

**श्री संघप्रिय गौतम** : उत्तर प्रदेश सदन को विश्वास में लिया जाएगा या नहीं ? ... **(व्यवधान)**...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Whether the Parliament... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Will the Minister give an assurance or not? (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): Mr. Minister, have you concluded? (*Interruptions*).

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Will the Minister give an assurance or not? (*Interruptions*).

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: No question of assraunce. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: We stage a walk-out. This reply was nothing but... (*Interruptions*) ... an eye-wash. (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): Don't point at the Chair. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: How can the Government mortgage the sovereignty... (*Interuptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): Is there a point of order? (*Interruptions*). I adjourn the House for lunch till 2.30 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at fifty-one minutes past one of the clock.

---

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty-four minutes past two of the clock.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH): in the Chair.

## SPECIAL MENTIONS

### Need to provide central security cover to the Governor of Tamil Nadu

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, in this Special Mention, I seek permission to lay on the Table two letters written by the Governor of Tamil Nadu to the Home Minster which my sources in the Home Ministry gave me. I authenticate these letters with your permission. From these two letters and other information that I have, it is clear that the Governor feels a definite sense of insecurity and does not have confidence that the Tamil Nadu Government can provide the necessary security cover. Hence he has asked for Central Security. The security concern of the Governor is justified in view of certain developments in Tamil Nadu. For example, recently, when the Governor went by road at night to Pondicherry, the heavy vehicular traffic in the opposite direction was not regulated. Further, although the security detail given to the Governor by the Tamil Nadu Government ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN (Tamil Nadu): Sir, matters relating to a Governor should not be discussed in the House... (*Interruptions*) He is divulging information which is not... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: The matter relates to the Governor's security... (*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN (Tamil Nadu): Security is a matter of concern. It has been allowed... (*Interruptions*) How can he be prevented from making his statement? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: He is charging that the Governor...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH): Mr. Swaminathan, please sit down... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: Give me some time after him. The Deputy Chairman has allowed me...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH): Kindly take your seat... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: I fully concur with the sentiments expressed by Mr. Subramanian Swamy that adequate security has to be given to the Governor... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA (Bihar): Aspersions should not be cast against the Tamil Nadu Assembly... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: I did not say it on record. I said it to him.

Further, although the security detail given to the Governor by the Tamil Nadu Government is sufficient